


FCC MAIL ROOM

AUG 10 1998

RECEIVED

CLEAR CREEK MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY



August 4, 1998

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Magaline Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Dear Ms. Salas:

Enclosed are the original and sixteen (16) copies of the comments of Clear Creek Mutual Telephone Company in response to the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in CC Docket No. 98-77.

Also enclosed is one copy of our comments to be stamped and returned in the enclosed self addressed stamped envelope.

Any questions regarding this filing may be directed to me at (503) 631-2101 or via e-mail at mmoorew@ccwebster.net.

Sincerely,

Mitchell Moore
President

Enclosures (18)

cc: Competitive Pricing Division
Common Carrier Bureau
Room 518
1919 M Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

International Transcription Service
1231 20th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mo. of C. in rec'd 0216
10/1/98

FCC MAIL ROOM

AUG 10 1998

RECEIVED

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
Access Charge Reform for Incumbent)	CC Docket No. 98-77
Local Exchange Carriers Subject to)	
Rate-of-Return Regulation)	

Comments of Clear Creek Mutual Telephone Company

Clear Creek Mutual Telephone Company is a small rural local exchange carrier serving 3,716 access lines in the State of Oregon. These comments focus on the impact of certain proposals included in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) for access reform for rate-of-return incumbent local exchange carriers.


Specifically, we oppose the proposed rule change to allocate a portion of the General Support Facilities to the Billing and Collection category. While this procedure may be appropriate for price cap companies who provision the Billing & Collection service using their own computers, it is not appropriate for the small rural LECs that rely heavily on service bureaus for the provisioning of this service. Small LECs have very little opportunity to reduce billing & collection costs because they are dependent on outside service bureaus for providing this service. Other rule changes over the years have tended to allocate more and more cost to the interstate billing and collection category to the point that many small companies can no longer make a profit on the service. This proposed

change to the Part 69 allocation rules will provide many small LECs with the unintended incentive to terminate Billing & Collection agreements with IXC's.

In 1996 Clear Creek Mutual Telephone Company had \$60,992 revenue for the interstate billing and collection service compared to a cost of \$74,999 resulting in a loss of \$14,007 before the OB&C change and the proposed GSF change. The change in OB&C rules applied to the 1996 costs results in an interstate billing and collection cost of \$77,174 which increases the loss on the service to \$16,182. Taking this analysis the next step and folding in the proposed GSF change results in a cost assigned to interstate billing and collection of \$91,156, increasing the loss on the service to \$30,164.

We ask the Commission to reject the proposed change, which would jeopardize the billing and collection service currently provided to interexchange carriers.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Mitchell A. Moore". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Mitchell A. Moore
President
Clear Creek Mutual Telephone Company